RESERVATION

Class 265.36R Book G66
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

RESERVATION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/reservation0000jewa

# RESERVATION

ADDRESSES BY

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

THE RIGHT REV.

CHARLES GORE, D.D.

AND

THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE

THE RIGHT REV.

J. E. WATTS-DITCHFIELD, D.D.

TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD

TOGETHER WITH

A SERIES OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MCMXVII

*All rights reserved*

265.36R
G66

65315

OLIN THEO SEMINARY
LIBRARY

# PREFACE

## THE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

THIS volume contains an account of the proceedings at a meeting held on Easter Thursday and attended by some four hundred clergy in the Diocese of Chelmsford.

It should be understood that no discussion was intended as to the legality of Reservation in any form, or as to the power of the bishops of the province collectively to permit, as an emergency measure, Reservation for the Sick. Such questions are important, cannot be ignored and must receive adequate attention; but the main subject of both the addresses of the Bishop of Oxford and of myself was that of "Access to the Reserved Sacrament for Prayer and Adoration." This should be borne in mind when the addresses are read.

The Bishop of Oxford was reluctant to let this account of an unwritten address be printed, for reasons which will be easily understood. In particular he felt that a subject like this wants fortifying with careful notes containing references and quotations. But he has kindly agreed to let it be printed as it stands.

My address was not written, but was based largely upon what had gone before, and in correcting the proof, I felt that it was wiser to leave it as it was said rather than to revise it seriously. I have, however, inserted two paragraphs on points on which I was prevented speaking owing to the length of the meeting. The Bishop of Oxford's address justifies the publication of this volume, but it may be useful to have also before us the thoughts of many men on this subject as revealed by the questions put to and answered by the

Bishop of Oxford. My own contribution lay in presenting questions which must be faced rather than in dealing directly with the subject itself.

In sending this record forth, I do so in the hope that it may help in settling men's minds and in preventing an agitation which can only divide and weaken the Church at a time when her undivided effort should be centred on the real work for England and for the world entrusted to her by her Lord.

Never was there a time when it was more necessary for the "Veni Creator" to be sung by the whole Church. Never was there a greater need to make known the Incarnate Son of God and proclaim the Story of Bethlehem and of Calvary. Never was there greater urgency for the message that the Brotherhood of men can alone be fully realized in the Fatherhood of God. Never has there been a greater opportunity for the Church to

present herself as the Body of Christ, uniting in Him men of all nations and languages, than at the present

Must this great opportunity be either entirely or partially lost owing to controversy on a question of this kind, important though it is.

Even if the contention of those signing the recent "Memorial" be proved, is there not a Blessing waiting for men who, for the sake of the peace of the whole Body, give way, and wait and pray until they gain their end, not by force or agitation or remonstrance, but by the "Indwelling Spirit" making the question clear to the whole Church? "Is not this the better way?" What saith the Spirit? May we be still and quiet and submissive enough to hear His Voice.

J. E. CHELMSFORD.

BISHOPSCOURT, CHELMSFORD,
*May* 5, 1917.

# CONTENTS


PAGE

Introduction by the Bishop of Chelmsford, the Right Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, D.D. . . . . 11

Address by the Bishop of Oxford, the Right Rev. Charles Gore, D.D. . 15

Questions and Answers . . . 66

Address by the Bishop of Chelmsford, the Right Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, D.D. . . . . 90

# RESERVATION

*The Proceedings were commenced with the Hymn, "Come, Thou Holy Spirit, come," a selection of Collects, and the singing of the "Veni Creator."*

## THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE

MAY I thank you for coming, especially in these days of difficulty of travel and of increased expense. Nothing but the importance and urgency of the question of Reservation would have induced me to call you together at this time. I am sorry that this question has been raised, but now that it has been raised, I felt that I should like to call the clergy together so that we might hear

what one has to say whom we are very privileged to have among us. May I just say that the Bishop of Oxford and I, although we may have differed very many times in the past, have always been very warm friends. Whether we may agree or may not agree with all that the Bishop of Oxford has written or spoken on this or any other question, I think that, looking at the last twenty years, we have all recognized that the Bishop of Oxford has done probably more than any other man to advance the cause of Reservation and to bring it into the realm of practical politics; and I therefore felt that he was the man of all others that I should ask to come here to-day and speak to us on *this* particular question. He has very kindly consented to answer questions at the close, and after those questions have been asked—and I shall myself take a most careful note of them for

my own consideration—I shall then give the closing address.

Now, Bishop of Oxford, we ask you to address us. I may tell you that I believe that the diocese as a whole has been praying about your visit. I asked that this morning in every church there should be a Celebration or a gathering for prayer that your visit might be blessed. We do not want this to be looked upon merely as a public meeting; we do not want this to be looked upon merely as a kind of lecture; but we want it to be looked upon as a gathering in which we, as bishops and priests, have come, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit Whom we have invoked, to listen to what you have to say to us. If we feel that what you say is in accordance with Holy Scripture we shall receive it; if not, we shall reject it; and we know that you are coming in like manner. I have a letter which you

wrote to me the other day in which you said that you would come, after offering much prayer that you might be guided aright. May I ask you, Bishop, now to address us. We are all ready to hear what you have to say to us.

## THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

MY brethren, I will do my best. The subject ramifies, as you are very well aware, and also has manifold roots; and to-day I propose to treat the subject of Reservation on a rather broad basis because I think that only on that basis does its real significance emerge. I propose to treat it not only as a practical expedient to meet a practical necessity, but on the basis of the whole doctrine and practice of the Eucharist. Of course, like other people, I am profoundly sorry that the question of Reservation has arisen as it has arisen at this moment, because I am quite convinced that the form in which the

question and controversy have arisen is calculated, particularly at this moment, to alienate what you may call the average good Englishman of almost every class and creed, whereas on the other hand I have always felt, and feel increasingly, that if we could get back to the conception of the Eucharist in its bearings and its issues which prevailed over the whole Church for a thousand years and which still prevails, though much more brokenly and obscuredly, we should have got to something which ought to commend itself at this moment most particularly to just those thoughts about human brotherhood and fellowship and membership under the One Father, in Christ, by His Spirit which give us the very best and quickest access to the minds of just those English men and English women whom we should wish most to touch, those who, though they are largely alienated from us, have

got in them so much of the mind and spirit of our Lord. So I am going back to the beginning, and I would ask you to do what I am sure it is extremely profitable to do—to try first of all, disembarrassing our minds from all preconceptions, to think of the first institution of the Eucharist and of the significance which that very simple and striking ceremony must have had for the minds of those who first witnessed it.

When our Lord at that solemn hour, in the midst of His disciples, took the bread off the supper-table and gave thanks and blessed it and broke and distributed it, and took the cup of mixed wine and water and blessed it and gave all to drink of the one cup, and said, "Do this in My memorial," it meant that He was laying a quite unique stress and significance upon this ceremony. He was making it, as the Church understood from the first, the sacrament of

membership for those who belonged to Him, and the ceremony had a quite unmistakable meaning. It meant a sharing together—that is, I believe, the precise and exact meaning of *κοινωνία* —" communion." That in which they were to share together was our Lord Himself in His humanity. " Take eat, this is My body. Drink ye all of it—This is My blood of the Covenant." The bread broken symbolized His body broken on the Cross. The red wine symbolized His blood shed for them. But they were much more than symbols. Under those humble forms He thus gives Himself in respect of His sacrificed humanity to be the bond of fellowship among men, as well as the sanctification of their individual souls and lives. " The cup which we bless, is it not a sharing together in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a sharing together in the Body of Christ? For

we, the many, are one bread, one body, for we are all partakers from the one bread." I am quite sure that the more we meditate upon the central and primary significance of the Sacrament as it was plainly understood at the beginning, that conception of fellowship in Christ's humanity communicated to us, detaches itself as of supreme importance.

I think there is nothing more full of satisfaction than to read the early accounts of the Eucharist, and no literature more inspiring in all the literature of the early Church than the Liturgies. I will only give one example, and that from the Liturgy of the Church of Rome. I do not know whether many of you have read that quite delightful tract by a Roman layman, Edmund Bishop, which you will find in one of those red volumes of Essays on Ceremonial which are published by the Delamore Press. That tract is called *The Genius of the*

*Roman Rite.* It is extraordinarily frank and fearless and well worth your study; but I am not going to do more than mention it now. I am going to base what I say upon the First Order, the Ordo Primus, which you will also find published in one of those red volumes, which is the earliest of the accounts of the Roman Mass in detail. It can be dated at about A.D. 770 by very sure evidence, but it goes back in substance, with a few details which would require to be altered, very much earlier, behind Gregory the Great, and back into the fifth century, and it also remained substantially true for some centuries later. It represents the worship of the Roman Church, you may say, broadly and substantially, over the first thousand years.

I would ask you to put yourself as if you were a stranger in one of the great Roman basilicas on Sunday morning when the Mass was to be celebrated.

You would have seen the great congregation assemble: you would have heard the sounds of the arrival of the Pontiff in solemn procession at the Church. You would have seen the introduction of the Book of the Gospels and the whole congregation rising as the Gospel Book passed them and was placed upon the altar. Then you would have seen the opening procession as the Pope, with the Choir, came in, preceded by the seven lights and the incense, the incense being used at this introductory procession and in the procession going out, and otherwise during the service, only (substantially as it is used now) at the reading of the Gospel. And then you would have seen the Bishop making his prayers at a fald-stool before the altar, and then going to his throne and turning eastward for the prayer and the Collect, and sitting down for the Epistle, and then standing for the reading of the

Gospel. That is the introductory part. After about the sixth century you would have heard also, at the beginning of the service, the singing of the Kyrie: and of the Gloria in Excelsis which introduced the first addresses to our Lord which occurred in the Mass in Rome. After the Gospel there might have been a sermon, but that was a very rare thing in the Roman Church. It would have been a common thing in most parts of the world. That constituted the introductory portion and, of course, in earlier days would have completed the Mass of the Catechumens and would have been followed by the dismissal of those who were not privileged to attend the Mysteries. But that had ceased before the time of this Order. All the introductory portion of the service would have been very much what we should be familiar with to-day. But something would have followed, quite

different from anything you are accustomed to, and that in connexion with the offertory. You would have seen the Pope and his attendant ministers going down among the congregation and making a very elaborate collection of loaves and wine, in bags and immense flagons, from the whole congregation. That was their corporate oblation, and it was elaborately carried out, the Pope himself offering his loaf, the clergy their loaves, the chief officers of the city their loaves, and the men and women of the congregation their loaves and offerings of wine. While that was being done there occurred what Edmund Bishop calls the spreading of the table-cloth, one deacon taking the end of the long, white cloth and throwing the other end to the deacon at the other end of the altar. Then followed the laying of the loaves in order, with the great chalice, upon the altar till the altar

was furnished with this great corporate oblation of the whole people. Then there was the singing of the Sursum Corda and the Sanctus (the Benedictus not yet having been added) and then the recitation by the Pope, apparently facing the people, of the canon up to the end of the Lord's Prayer. During all the recitation of the canon there was no moment of consecration to which special attention was called or emphasis was given. There was the offering of the oblation; there were intercessions; there was the recitation of the institution and the commemoration of the passion and resurrection of the Lord and the prayer for the acceptance of the oblation upon the heavenly altar, which apparently takes the place in the Roman rite of any direct invocation of God upon the elements, and then the commemoration of the dead, and the Lord's Prayer. Then again you would

have seen something which would have arrested you as unlike anything to which you had been accustomed. The oblation of the people, offered, accepted, consecrated, is now again, by a process which is very elaborately described, prepared for the great corporate communion,[1] the bread broken and put into bags held by the acolytes, and the wine in the chalice which had been consecrated poured into the bowls or flagons of still unconsecrated wine which were thereby apparently held to be consecrated, and then the great communion of the people; first the Pope, not communicating himself, but communicated by the Archdeacon, then himself communicating the chief of the clergy, and then the communion by the Pope and others of the whole body of people, the

[1] After about 700 the Agnus Dei was introduced at this point, before the commixture and the kiss of peace.

people being communicated in the species of wine through a reed; and when that was done there was a post-communion prayer and the *Ite Missa est.*

If you now think of the order of a modern High Mass you will see the striking differences which the ancient ceremony must have presented to an observer; you will see, I mean, that the prominent idea was that of the great corporate oblation offered, accepted, consecrated, and returned as now Christ's Body and His Blood to be the spiritual food for the sanctification of the souls and bodies of His people and to bind them all into a corporate whole. And the ceremony is unperplexed by any other element or feature. It speaks for itself; it maintains itself with remarkable fidelity to the fundamental idea of the institution. Whatever ceremonial decoration or adornment there is in no way detracts from

the simplicity of the original governing idea.

Now I would ask you to let your minds go on a thousand years to the High Mass of the Western Church at the present day. (I say a thousand years because I do not want to delay over the question of the moment when particular alterations or changes of idea took place.) I would ask you to let your minds pass to a modern High Mass and to note the main and characteristic difference, and that is the total obscuration of the whole corporate idea of sacrifice and communion. In every way, and some ways rather subtle, the corporate idea was maintained in the original service. I say in some subtle ways—for example, a fragment of the consecrated element of bread reserved from the Mass of the previous Sunday was put into the chalice after the Lord's Prayer. That was the ceremony of the *Sancta* designed to con-

nect one celebration with the other that there might be continuity. Again there was what was called the ceremony of the "fermentum," which was the sending of a portion of the consecrated element of bread from the Pope's Mass to all the chief churches of Rome in order to connect the Masses said in all the other churches with the Pope's Mass. There was the rule of celebrating only one Mass in each church on one day. All these details maintained the idea of corporate unity. But above all of course the act itself, in which all the clergy joined, and on certain occasions all concelebrated; and the whole ceremony, both of oblation and of distribution, kept prominent and clear before the mind the corporate idea. Take the jump of a thousand years and you find that that has been obscured to a vanishing point in three ways. Partly because the share of the people in the

action has been immensely reduced: partly because the priest has himself become isolated from the whole corporation and body of the Church, each priest saying his own Mass, and Masses being indefinitely multiplied in order that this may be so: partly because the whole idea of corporate character has been lost both from the oblation and from the administration, the chief service having for centuries become a service in which the people do not communicate; finally because communion has become, to a degree that it would be hardly possible to exaggerate, an individual act. The individual Christian makes, whether outside the service or at low Mass, his own private communion, but the corporate idea has gone, and the solemn service which is intended to be the great corporate act of worship,[1] on which all the elaboration

[1] In many parts of Europe it is this no longer.

of ceremony and music is concentrated, has ceased to be a service of communion at all except in the person of the celebrant himself.

Now, if the appeal to antiquity has real and rational ground, as for my own part I profoundly believe it has, our Prayer Book was quite right in demanding the return to the corporate character of communion. The actual development of our worship after the Reformation in England was no doubt disastrous and resulted in the totally unjustifiable dethronement of the Lord's own Service from its proper position as the unmistakably central service of the Sunday; and communion with us too became an individual act; so I do not think that we can say that any abuse to which the Eucharist has been subject in the Roman Church is greater than the abuse to which it has been subject amongst ourselves; but I am

quite sure that we shall never touch the bottom of our difficulties until we recognize that there is no way of being true to the original intention of the service except by the restoration of the corporate character of communion which is fundamental and essential. In spite of all difficulties in our path we must deliberately set our faces in the direction of making the chief service of the Sunday the act of corporate communion.

Then, if, again, I ask you to contemplate the Holy Communion at the beginning and the end of that thousand years, in the Roman Church, the second great change which you would find had taken place would be a doctrinal change ; that is, to put it in one word, the formulation of the doctrine—I solemnly believe you must call it the error—of transubstantiation. I believe that the three great faults of the doctrine of

transubstantiation are these: first that it violates the principle of the Incarnation, the principle which in the fifth century was insisted on both as regards our Lord's person and as regards the Eucharist; the principle, that is to say, that the higher and divine nature does not obliterate or destroy the lower nature which it uses—that in our Lord's person the divine nature does not obscure or destroy the human, and that in the Eucharist the divine presence does not destroy or obliterate the material substances of bread and wine. But I am not at present proposing to say anything about that. Then, secondly, a great flaw in the doctrine of transubstantiation is, as it appears to me cannot be denied, that it fastens upon the Church a philosophical theory which in lapse of time has entirely passed from the minds of men; that is the distinction of substance and accident

in material things, but about that, again, I do not propose to say anything.

But the most serious flaw in the doctrine of transubstantiation (not as it is somewhat loosely held in the Eastern Church, but as it was defined in the Western Church), is one which, the more you think about it, the more disastrous I believe you will find it to be; that is that its logical consequences will be found to defeat the object for which the real Presence was vouchsafed to us. The purpose of the Presence, as expressed in all the liturgies, was conceived to be the communion of the faithful in the Body and Blood of Christ: that is in our Lord's sacred and glorified humanity. The sacred humanity, and thereby Christ Himself in His whole person, was believed by communion to be imparted for the permanent nourishment of the communicant's whole nature and for

the binding together ever more closely of the whole Church in Him, the second Adam. This is the effect of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood—that we may abide in Him and He, as He is both God and Man, in us. On this the Fathers insist with great unanimity.

But that great and deep purpose of the real Presence has had its very roots cut in the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. According to this doctrine the Divine Presence, the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood, is so attached to, and I should say subjected to, the material accidents, that it is a necessary consequence of the doctrine that, as soon as the accidents begin to change, that is to say after a few minutes, as soon as digestion begins in the communicant—(it is an extremely disagreeable subject, but it is absolutely necessary to face it)—there is a reconversion of the material

elements into their original nature of bread and wine, now in process of digestion, and the Divine Presence wholly ceases. I have endeavoured elsewhere to prove that this is in fact the authoritative Roman teaching, and I am sure that if you ask any sufficiently instructed Roman Catholic theologian, he will admit it. In an article that I recently wrote in *The English Church Review* I quoted answers which I had received from Father Rickaby, who is an admirable authority, and who is quite emphatic and quite clear, and in the April number of *The English Church Review* there is a quotation from the Roman Catholic Journal *The Month* which, again, is quite unhesitating. This is the quotation: "Of course to have Him in our hearts in Holy Communion is more in itself than to have Him near to us in the tabernacle. But we have Him in Holy Communion only for a few minutes at

a time,[1] and in proportion as we believe this and take it to heart is our desire to seek His presence in the tabernacle again and again." Now I do very much want the whole Church of England, so far as they are interested in this subject, to face this. There is hardly anything in the whole circle of Catholic theology more important or more emphasized by Fathers, Greek and Latin, than the purpose of Communion; that is the imparting to us of our Lord's manhood in order that in that manhood, communicated to us and passing to the nourishment of soul and body, we may live in Him and He in us. In an article which Dr. Stone wrote also in *The English Church Review* he gave instances of language implying, as it seemed to him, that the older view had not been repudiated in the Roman Church; but,

[1] And it must be added in our mouths not in our hearts.

in fact, though there is a certain amount of clinging to the old language, it always has to be explained away, and that, for a reason that is absolutely conclusive, that is, that according to the Roman doctrine there is actually nothing, sacred or spiritual, which remains after the reconversion which is identified with the moment of the first beginning of digestion : there is nothing spiritual or sacramental which remains, nothing whatever. Thus, if you look into later mediæval and modern Roman books about the effect of the Sacrament, you will see that the doctrine is profoundly embarrassed for that very reason, and that though there is sometimes language used which looks like a reflection of the old language, it always has to be explained away ; and again I quote Father Rickaby, who is quite explicit about the subject. "When I was young," he writes to me, "I found much consolation in a little

French work *Jesus vivant en nous* founded on the text Colossians i. 26 ('Christ in you'), and explaining it, as I think you are inclined to explain it, but afterwards I found the book was put upon the *Index*." The fact is that the ancient Catholic doctrine of the permanent strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine, had had its roots cut and destroyed by the Roman doctrine. The Body and Blood of Christ are so identified with, I should say subjected to, material conditions that when, after a few minutes, these cease to exist, the sacramental gift is wholly gone. There is nothing left to nourish the soul unless Christ be supposed to infuse into us, as some Roman theologians hold, some special gift of His Holy Spirit during this temporary visit, but for this idea there is literally no scriptural or ancient authority.

Again I would ask you to consider this interval of a thousand years between the moment, 770, from which I gave you the account of the First Order, down to the modern Roman use and doctrine. The third great difference which you would note would be the concentration of attention in the Mass upon a certain moment—the moment of consecration and elevation and upon the specific object, the Host. You must distinguish that later elevation immediately following consecration from the primitive elevation. You would find an excellent account of the whole subject in Adrian Fortescue's book on the Mass. You must distinguish it from the primitive elevation which existed in most of the liturgies, in which immediately before Communion the holy gifts were elevated with the words "Holy things for the holy people." Of course the new elevation was introduced distinctly and con-

fessedly as the result of the new emphasis which was laid upon the subject by the doctrine of transubstantiation. That resulted first of all in an emphasis upon the moment of consecration which was quite absent from the ancient liturgies, and then in a quite new devotion to the Host as an isolated object. It became the great and passionate desire of the faithful to see the Host. That, you know, forms a very conspicuous feature in mediæval devotion. I daresay you will remember the famous phrase in which Thomas Becon, Cranmer's chaplain, in an extremely disagreeable work, tells us how this desire to see the Host had been characteristic of Englishmen, and how if the priest did not elevate the Host sufficiently high there would be heard cries from all parts of the church, "Heave it higher, Sir John; heave it higher." Adrian Fortescue quotes that passage again and gives a great number of

instances of the intense insistence upon the seeing of the Host. The consequence of that was very marked; it was a concentration of attention upon a moment and upon an object, as distinct from a process and an action. The original idea of the Eucharist was that of a continuous action upward to Heaven and downward to earth; but there was no concentration upon a moment and an object. It was the lifting up of the oblation of the Church before the Father, and the return of that oblation glorified and transmuted to be the food for the souls of men. The adoration was the adoration in preparation for the moment of communion. It made an immense change in the whole balance of Eucharistic devotion when there emerged that concentration on the moment and the object.

Thus, fourthly, you reach the last change to which I must call your atten-

tion [1]; that was the development of the extra-liturgical use of the Blessed Sacrament. It is obvious, that if the Host, in itself, was the great object of devotion, there was no reason in the world why the Object of devotion should not be perpetuated and made constant, so that a desire arose, as is very easily intelligible, which took effect in the extra-liturgical adoration of the Sacrament—in the tabernacle, in the monstrance and in processions and, finally, in Benediction. You know the famous statement of the Roman theologian, Father Thurston, which you have very often seen quoted, I dare say, that there was not for a thousand years any clear instance of any Christian seeking the reserved Sacrament in order to pray before it.[2]

[1] I am saying nothing here of the withdrawal of the chalice from all but the celebrant.

[2] We have had two books lately, one Dr. Stone's book on *The Reserved Sacrament*, and the other

Dr. Stone quotes Father Thurston's statement and is disposed to think that there is *one* instance. Well, there is one instance of almost everything in the world, so that I should not be very much surprised if there were one instance of it; but I am bound to say I do not believe that the one instance which he quotes, which is a passage of famous difficulty about St. Gregory Nazienzen's sister Gorgonia, can carry the meaning which he seeks to attribute to it. I believe that Father Thurston is indisputably right in rejecting the idea that Gorgonia is described as seeking for purposes of adoration the sacrament reserved in church. She is described as going to the church and to the altar and " anoint-

Fr. Freestone's book, the twenty-first issue of the Alcuin Club Collection, called *The Sacrament Reserved* (Mowbray). Now, I must frankly say that I think Fr. Freestone's book is the completer and more trustworthy.

ing her whole body with the medicine which proceeded from herself," which I have no doubt means her tears, as is afterwards described, and also as applying to her body " whatever of the antitypes of the precious body or blood her hand treasured," mingling this with her tears and so obtaining healing. Father Thurston, oddly enough, thinks that this means that they were so careless in those days in the administration of the Sacrament that the woman could go and find crumbs and fragments of the Blessed Sacrament left there, and that this is what is referred to as the treasure which she had succeeded in collecting into her hand; but I do not myself think that there is really much doubt that what is meant is that she brought with her to Church the Sacrament which at that time, as you very well know, it was the custom for Christians to reserve for communicating themselves in their own

houses. I do not think there is really much doubt about that. Any way, I think you have to choose between Father Thurston's interpretation and that interpretation. I do not think that Dr. Stone has in any way shaken Father Thurston's statement about the absence of any clear indication of the extra-liturgical use of the Blessed Sacrament for devotion for a thousand years. There were a good many abuses—ways of using the Blessed Sacrament as a charm, which you can only call abuses—as when people carried it about with them for safety, or when they buried it with the dead, or when they put it into altars for consecration, and so on, which abuses were at various dates abolished, but the particular use of it for purposes of extra-liturgical adoration was totally absent.

Now I have laid before you the basis on which I stand and I have four or five points remaining which I would seek to

make. Having laid my basis I can make them rapidly, though I dare say they will provide the main subject of the questions which will be asked of me, if there are questions.

1. The true aim of Anglicanism is the restoration of what is both catholic and primitive. I have tried to put before you what were the ideas with regard to the Holy Sacrament dominant for the first thousand years of the Church's life. I have tried to emphasize the intensely and essentially corporate character of the Eucharistic service. I have tried to show that what is at stake is not the doctrine of the real Presence or the real objective Presence, but the use to which it is to be put. I have tried to emphasize the intense insistence upon the purpose for which it was given which prevailed for a thousand years and which still prevails in the unchanged tradition of the Eastern Church. I know that Dr. Stone, among

other people, has said that there is no reason to associate the extension of the extra-liturgical use of the Blessed Sacrament with that change of doctrine which has occurred in the Roman Church. But I think it is impossible to maintain this. The last words of Fr. Freestone's book are these—" The original purpose of official Reservation [i.e. Reservation in Church] was purely practical [for Communion]. The development of any cultus of the Reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief." I cannot doubt that that was the case. Also I have no doubt the craving for the permanent external shrine of presence is associated with the weakening, even the abolition, of that sense of the permanent presence of Christ in respect of His manhood in us of which I have spoken. I speak as a person who did passionately love the Roman devotion,

but in my own experience I did find that from the time when I read Wilberforce's books and began to understand what I am sure is the really catholic doctrine of the presence of Christ in us, in respect of His humanity, I began to feel that the sense of the interior presence of *Christ in us* weakened the desire for the exterior visit. I would again refer to those words which I quoted just now from *The Month*: "Of course to have Him in our hearts in Holy Communion is more in itself than to have Him near to us in the tabernacle. But we have Him in Holy Communion only for a few minutes at a time, and in proportion as we believe this and take it to heart is our desire to seek His presence in the tabernacle again and again." I am quite sure that those words of the Roman Catholic journal express the truth with regard to that desire on the whole. Now, I do not think it is possible to deny that the put-

ting of the Holy Eucharist to a new use totally different from any use recognized in the Church for a thousand years, different from any use recognized in the Eastern Church up to the present day, different from any use which is directly or indirectly suggested in the New Testament,[1] is something which has about it a great venturesomeness, a great presumption. Men had exhibited a similar presumption in early days. They tried to use the Blessed Sacrament in various ways as a charm, but the Church stood firm and said, " No, it must not be used

[1] The New Testament constantly suggests that the union with the Heavenly Christ, by the Holy Spirit, of which the sacraments are the instruments, is the better *substitute for* the external relationship to Christ which the disciples had in the days of His flesh. Yet this external relationship involved much which has no counterpart in visits to the Blessed Sacrament—the hearing His Words, the seeing His Works, the looking up into His Eyes.

in this way." This later use, however, the Roman Church has authorized, but the more you look at the grounds of that authorization the more, I believe, you will find that it is bound up with a false materialistic theology of the Blessed Sacrament and with a disastrous denial of what is fundamental in the ancient and catholic idea of the purpose of the Blessed Sacrament.

2. Then, next, I should like to emphasize that the elements of the later Roman cultus are inseparable. You cannot take a bit and leave the rest. Elevation to see the Host led on to the permanent external shrine and the seeking of the external Presence in the tabernacle, and that then led on, for obvious reasons, to the monstrance, to processions of the Blessed Sacrament and to Benediction. The plea now is that we should be content with public Reservation in the tabernacle which admits of " visits to the Blessed

Sacrament" and that we should abandon the desire for the monstrance or for Benediction. I do not deny that this arrested development might last for a year, but I am certain that the whole impulse of logic and devotion renders these various uses so closely inter-connected that, if we feel bound to make a stand against the development as a whole, we must make it at the beginning and not at any later point. Indeed, Mr. Hanbury Tracy and others make no concealment of the goal at which they would desire to arrive, though they would be prepared to accept limitations by the way. But I ask you to consider what happens if you have the Blessed Sacrament reserved upon the side altar of a church. The side altar becomes the centre of interest in the church. You know that the meetings of the C.B.S. would be in front of that altar. You know that it would become the practice

of the devout that they should pay their daily visits to the Blessed Sacrament. You know that any parochial guild would meet in front of the Blessed Sacrament. You know that it would be necessary to make genuflexions towards the Blessed Sacrament ; that altar would become the centre of devotion. Then also there would be a passionate desire to get the tabernacle open ; and there would be no particular reason why it should not be so : and after a very little time the full Roman use of the Blessed Sacrament would almost inevitably be developed. I am quite sure that, if there is to be a stand anywhere, the stand must be at the first step.

3. I have not talked about the desirability of admitting Reservation for the purpose for which it has always been admitted in the Church—the communion of the sick—because, possibly, it is not here called in question. I, at any rate,

do not see that there is anything to be said against it. I deeply deplore that it ever was abandoned, and I have always, ever since I thought about the subject, greatly desired its restoration. If anybody had told me, however, when I was made a bishop that within fifteen years I should see it restored by universal agreement among the bishops of our own province, I should have thought that that was too good to be true; but it is the fact now. It is agreed to admit Reservation for the communion of the sick, but not under such conditions as admit of free access to it by the faithful for the purpose of devotion. That is implied in the words of our proposed rubric on which we are agreed to act—"For no other purpose whatsoever" except the communion of the sick. About that proposal I should like to say that I think there is no question of real difficulty, if only there is the will to accept the limita-

tion. What is asked is that we should return to the ancient method of reserving the Blessed Sacrament in the aumbry: a use earlier than the use which characterized our own country of reserving it over the high altar in the hanging pyx. This aumbry was a cupboard either in the sacristy or in one of the side walls of the chancel. If you have an aumbry with double doors and covered by a curtain you will have the Blessed Sacrament reserved under conditions which by the modern Roman rules put it outside the conditions of adoration: because you only pay notice to the Blessed Sacrament if, as another Roman Catholic friend of mine has told me, it is "in the same room with you." There is really no difficulty about the matter, I believe, if there is simply the will to accept the limitation.

4. Next, I cannot admit the reasonableness of the suggestion that under the

Prayer Book it is competent for any priest to reserve the Blessed Sacrament at all, still less to reserve it publicly in the church, at his own discretion. It is a very interesting question whether the abolition of Reservation was an over-violent dealing with a catholic custom. I think that it was a needless abandonment of a catholic custom, just as, no doubt, with regard to the marriage of the clergy, we did, rightly or wrongly, abandon a very old-standing catholic custom; but it is too late to talk about that now. What I mean is that, if in my conscience I reach the conclusion that the action of the Reformers involved an intolerable violation of catholic custom, then I have no right at all to submit myself to the Prayer Book. And if I do submit myself to the Prayer Book I am quite sure that I put myself in a position in which I cannot possibly claim to have liberty to restore Reservation at my own discretion.

You know that there has been a discussion as to whether canonical laws lapse by mere desuetude. Well, I have no doubt myself that they do lose authority by mere desuetude, but this is not a question of lapsing by mere desuetude. There is no question at all that *desuetude coupled with independent legislation in another sense* abolishes old canons; and what we have here is desuetude coupled with legislation in another sense. The Church of England made other legislation, other provision, for communicating the sick, rightly or wrongly. It made other provision; and you will find that it is impossible to examine the practice of the Church in canonical legislation and still to maintain that you can revive an ancient canon over the head of independent legislation in another sense, merely because the older legislation has not been explicitly repealed. I am sure of that. Thus if we are to have Reservation

at all, we are then thrown back on the authority of the Episcopate, which I think is covered by the phrase "except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." There has been a great deal of discussion as to what those words mean. They are vague words. But they are at least such as cover the action of the Episcopate. Under our sad condition of bondage we must make the most of the power of the Episcopate to deal with the circumstances of the time. The circumstances of the time require something more than the method of communicating the sick contemplated by the Prayer Book. The method of the Prayer Book is not abandoned, but it is supplemented by the revival of Reservation under the authority of individual bishops or (as now) by the united action of the Episcopate of our Province. For the bishops have been so impressed with the necessities of the times that they are prepared, unani-

mously, as far as I know, to authorize in this Province Reservation for the purpose of communion. Our recent Resolution was passed indeed not unanimously, but *nemine contradicente*. But, as far as I know, the bishops who did not vote for it, abstained from voting not because they were not prepared to allow Reservation at all, but because they were not prepared to observe the restriction "for no other purpose whatsoever."

Now, I have had a little controversy with Lord Halifax. Lord Halifax has complained of me for saying what I did not say at all—that he agreed with me in the view that it is not competent for any priest to claim Reservation at all except under Episcopal licence. That I do myself firmly hold, but I did not say that he agreed with me in that. What I did say was that he agreed with me or that his words used to the Royal Commission im-

plied that he agreed with me—that it is absolutely within the competence of the Episcopate to *regulate the use of Reservation*. I can indeed hardly conceive any one denying that. And the Episcopate of this Province has chosen to regulate it strictly and severely in a certain sense. I do not think you can say that this restriction involves any violent dealing with a catholic practice, and I think we are bound to accept the restriction—every one of us who has agreed to make the declaration in virtue of which alone we can accept any kind of clerical office in the Church of England. I believe that at this crisis we have been impressed with the necessity of not allowing the principle of "conscientious objection" too great a latitude. We know that it requires severe interpretation if it is to be justified in any emergency of nation or Church. Again I believe that we have become deeply impressed with

the hatefulness of the "scrap of paper" doctrine as a means of getting rid of an inconvenient obligation. But I am quite persuaded that we are in great danger ourselves in this respect. We need to think about it very seriously. I do from my heart repudiate and hate the form of argument from laxity to laxity, which allows me to say that, because I see somebody who is lax in one direction—shall I say somebody who is holding some high benefice in the Church and who disbelieves the Creed—therefore I shall allow myself similar laxity in another direction. That argument opens the flood-gates of immorality, and we must repudiate it from our very hearts. For my own part I try to be impartial. What I mean is this: I have always thought that there were restrictions which it is necessary to observe in all directions.

There is a limit both of teaching and ceremonial for the officer of the Church,

however large and comprehensive the liberty allowed us, both in the direction called Liberal, in that called Protestant, and in that called Catholic; and I fear I have felt bound to make myself disagreeable at different times impartially in each direction. As St. Paul teaches us, the corporate liberty of the Church involves definite limits, because it involves positive principles. Thus I am sure that the argument that laxity tolerated in some place and at some point in one direction justifies our taking similar licence in another direction is an argument which is profoundly inconsistent with the spirit of corporate loyalty and honour.

Then I do also very strongly urge that we should not suffer ourselves to use sophistical arguments. I think that our position is a position of very great difficulty. I have never been an optimist about the Church of England. I expect

we have bad times in front of us, such as will test the faith and patience of the best of us. But it is all the more necessary that we should keep our minds unsophisticated. We need to keep honest consciences and maintain only fair arguments. It is absurd to say I am *only* reserving the Blessed Sacrament for the communion of the sick if, in fact, I am reserving it with another purpose prominent in my mind—if in fact it is the desire to have the Blessed Sacrament as an object of worship which is the dominant motive in those desiring Reservation; as is sometimes the case not only in religious communities but in parish churches also. We must not juggle with words. If we want Reservation only for the purpose of communion of the sick we can have it. Or, again, consider frankly the argument that "the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past" means that everything

that was in the chancels in times past you can have in the chancels now, and therefore you can have the hanging pyx. That is a kind of argument which passes all the limits of legitimate reasoning.

Now I have done. I have spoken with all possible frankness because I think it is the time to do so. I believe that we are set to guard the true doctrine of the real objective presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as the ancient and undivided Church guarded it in old days, with the purpose always full in view for which our Lord vouchsafed it. I believe that the Roman development involves a great presumption, and the more impressed you are by the bold departure from ancient principles involved in this development, the more you will see that at the least it demands authority. There is an authority behind the development in the Roman Church, but that authority we are not in a position

to accept. There is nothing in the world which is more impossible than to accept the Roman authority in bits. There is nothing in the world more united and concentrated than the Roman authority, and Romanism without the Pope is, of all futilities, one of the most futile.

It is no doubt very distressing to be obliged to resist the establishment or maintenance amongst us of this specially Roman cultus of the Blessed Sacrament, when there is such a weight of emotion and desire pressing for its adoption and sanction. But there is a similar emotional pressure behind other claims doctrinal and practical which are made from other quarters. And in each case the Church must learn to discriminate: the authorities must learn carefully and wisely to bind as to loose: and the body of the Church must learn to submit sectional desires to the common good. For truly Catholicism means not any

particular set of doctrines so much as the real acceptance of the controlling mind both of the Catholic Church at large and of that part of the Catholic Church to which we belong.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE: With regard to any questions to be asked, may I say that we do not want the questions to be prefaced by speeches. Please let us have any questions without speeches.

QUESTIONER: May I ask Dr. Gore kindly to explain to us the exact difference between membership of Christ in Holy Baptism and membership of the body of Christ which comes through Holy Communion. Following on that I have a second question. If it is sacrilegious to be baptized more than once, is it sacrilegious to make your Communion more than once?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: That is a

very interesting question about membership in baptism. I have tried to give an answer as well as I can to it in a book called *The Body of Christ.* I think the truth is that it is the same gift of the incarnate life which is communicated to us in stages, that incorporation into that life is the gift of baptism, that the equipment of that life by the full gift of the Holy Spirit is the gift of confirmation, and the full fellowship in that divine-human life through the eating of Christ's flesh, and the drinking of His blood is the special gift of Holy Communion. But with regard to all spiritual gifts there are very great difficulties about drawing the line, as you know. The Fathers of the fifth century, Fulgentius and other people, when they were challenged with the problem, " If it is necessary to eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood in order to have life in you, then if you do not communicate infants

they have no life, or if they die before they are communicated they have no life," gave the answer that baptismal incorporation by itself is in its measure the eating of the flesh of Christ and the drinking of His blood. But probably you would not wish me to go on with that. I think that if you think of the one Divine gift in its different stages you will get at the truth, and I suppose that the frequency of communion is God's accommodation to our human need of reiteration.

QUESTIONER: May I supplement it. If there is this perpetual indwelling of Christ from Holy Communion, does that not rather imply that, having once made a communion, there is really no reason except deadly sin to cause us to make communion again?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: The Church has offered it to us every day. It is not really a matter of abstract logic. Holy

Communion is given us on the analogy of food, and the whole Church has always offered it to us every week or every day. I really do not in the least wish to maintain that the bishops have always been wise. I was not maintaining that at all; I was only endeavouring to deal with the situation as it stands. I do not in the least want to vindicate the action of the bishops, or to say that they ought not to have acted before, or anything of the kind. I only want to deal with the situation as it exists to-day.

QUESTIONER: Would his lordship tell us at what point does the resolution of the bishops of the Province override the express rubric at the end of the Communion Office, and, secondly, would his lordship tell us whether the consent of the laity is necessary to the setting up of any new resolution that the bishops may pass as bishops of the Church?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I am most anxious that we should reform ourselves in our methods as rapidly as possible and that we should restore canonical and constitutional action as rapidly as possible. I think that it has been the gravest sin of the Church of England that it has been content to go on with these old rubrics which do not really cover the situation, but, so long as we are tied and bound as we are now, I think the only thing to do is, as has been said by a wise voice, to make the most of the Prayer Book modified by episcopalism. I mean that you must make the most of the Prayer Book, the best of the Prayer Book, and then that the bishops must go as far as they can, where circumstances peremptorily demand it, in sanctioning additions or modifications.

QUESTIONER: Might I ask whether prohibition of access to the Reserved

Sacrament is not based on a theological inference concerning which theologians may permissibly differ?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Yes, I should have thought so. That is to say I should not wish to condemn the theological doctrine which you allude to [the Roman doctrine] as a theological opinion; but I think that the restriction of the practice of Reservation which is demanded by our bishops was not made in virtue of a particular theological opinion, but with a view to the practical necessities of the case. I do not think there has been any condemnation of opinion, but simply the restriction of a practice.

QUESTIONER: My question was whether the prohibition is based on a theological inference, and, if the inference is not accepted, what becomes of the practice?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Do you mind stating it a little more clearly?

QUESTIONER: I understood that a distinction was made between the indwelling Christ and the external Christ, and the indwelling Christ ought to obliterate the desire for approach to the external Christ. On that inference access to the Reserved Sacrament is prohibited. What of those who decline to accept the theological premises on which the practice is based?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I think that it would be a complete mistake to suppose that the directions given—they were not given specially by me—were based on a special theological distinction, though I believe that distinction to be true; I feel sure about the theological matter: but the bishops' requirement was not based upon it.

QUESTIONER: Then may I ask another question—whether the regulations imposed with the express intention of preventing devotion to the Reserved

Sacrament are not unprecedented in Christendom?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Surely no. Surely the whole revision of the Prayer Book in the sixteenth century was as a matter of fact directed by that sort of motive, rightly or wrongly—in my judgment partly rightly and partly wrongly. Both the errors and the merits of the sixteenth century changes were due to a desire to combat the pre-Reformation doctrine. I should have thought that there could be no question at all that the abandonment of the practice of Reservation in the sixteenth century was with a view to cutting at the roots of a growing cultus which there was a desire to get rid of. I should have thought that the literature of the sixteenth century abundantly bears that out. That is just what I mean. There are questions being asked now as to what is tolerable in a national Church

which it is too late to ask. They were taken for granted in the Prayer Book.

QUESTIONER: May I ask exactly what powers the bishops have in this matter. What I mean is this: is not constitutional synodical action of some sort or other wanted here? It is very difficult to put it into the form of a question. The bishops are acting apparently through Convocation or through the Upper House, but can they do anything against the rubrics of the Prayer Book without the Lower House of Convocation and without any legislation? and ought not the bishops, if they wish to get the support of the majority of Church of England people, as I believe they would, call a synod of the Clergy? Ought not our bishop, if he wishes it to be made clear how strongly we support him in this matter, to call a synod so that we can at any rate put some moral force behind him? I mean other than

the moral force which he has in his own person. If the bishop had the clergy behind him acting as a synod, would not that appeal to those who wished to defy the bishop? That is the sort of thing I mean.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I quite agree that we do intensely need to take steps to revive proper synodical government, but I do not know if you have ever gone into the question of diocesan synods. You know that the mediæval diocesan synod was not a synod for discussion at all; it was simply a place for the issuing of decrees over which they had no control at all. Let us by all means revive the primitive method of government by a bishop with a greatly reduced area of diocese, governing surrounded by his presbytery and also with the advice of his laity. I do not know that there is anything I desire so much. I am all for it, but you must

act with the forces which you have got. Take my diocese, for example. First of all, a diocesan synod, if it is to mean anything, must be a synod with a really limited number of persons. You cannot have a body of a thousand clergy, such as I have the happiness to endeavour to preside over, to discriminate and judge. Then, second, you have another constitution which is rather irregular, and that is the constitution of the two Houses of Convocation, and you must act through them. No doubt the action of the bishops in this matter is irregular in this sense. They are wishing to act regularly and regularize their action in a revised Prayer Book. Meanwhile the situation, they think, is so serious that they must do something in the interval, and the action in the interval which they take upon themselves does, no doubt, involve some interference with the letter of the Prayer Book, not in the matter of

public worship, but in the matter of the administration of the Holy Communion to the sick, because they think the exigencies of the situation require it. Meanwhile I do greatly deprecate our doing this, unless we are also going to strive earnestly for the restoration of proper synodical government; and then I am quite sure that, if we are to revive proper synodical government, we must revive it completely and let it take account of the laity as well as of the clergy.

QUESTIONER: Would the Bishop of Oxford admit that such action with the use of such forces as they have at the present moment is irregular?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I think I should say that we have fallen back upon powers which are inherent in the episcopate. I do not think that I should say that our action in this case was more irregular than the whole of our present

constitution. In the deepest sense I think that the whole position of the episcopate as it developed in the latter Middle Ages in England, with these immense dioceses and the isolation of the bishops, is irregular, and is as far as possible from the primitive constitution. I do profoundly desire a return to the primitive constitution; but, meanwhile, I do not think we have any alternative to episcopal action except an absolute refusal to go beyond the letter of the Prayer Book, and then you can have no Reservation whatever. I think we have taken the necessary steps to obtain a remedy for a most admitted evil, and that we have done it in the best way we can by falling back upon the powers inherent in the episcopate.

QUESTIONER: Where permission is given for the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the use of the sick, is

the Reservation to be in both kinds, or only in one?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: That is surely a matter for the bishop of the diocese, not for me. I know what answer I should give in my own diocese.

QUESTIONER: I would like to ask the Bishop of Oxford, if I may, how he would meet the very common and popular argument that, whatever is the theology behind the practice of Reservation, at any rate it works; it gets people to church; it develops devotion.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I think I know what the only answer you can give to that is. First of all, I am very sceptical as to the extent to which that is true; at least my own impression is that there is a great deal of what is best in England that is not at all attracted, but alienated, by this devotion. My impression is that it is only in a very limited area that it proves

attractive. I have no doubt at all that both this devotion, and many other developments of a quite different kind are attractive within a limited area. But I am not prepared to admit or to open the door to them, unless I feel sure that in their ultimate issues they are going to lead us right. I may add that I have no doubt that the whole modern Roman system "works well" within a certain area of mankind. But then I think it requires authority behind it. And that authority is not found except under the Pope.

QUESTIONER: Is there any appeal behind the bishop? Is there any authority to which we can appeal behind the bishop?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Behind the *bishop* or the *bishops*?

QUESTIONER: In the singular, my lord.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Yes, cer-

tainly. The appeal behind the singular is to the plural, is it not?

QUESTIONER: Might I ask the Bishop of Oxford how he relates the doctrine of the presence of the [glorified] humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Sacrament with the first night on which the Sacrament was instituted [when our Lord was not glorified]?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: That is one of the most difficult and subtle theological questions which you could ask, and it really has no bearing, has it, on this present discussion. I find it an extraordinarily difficult question to answer. I have read a certain number of books on it, from which I have got exceedingly little light. As it is not a very relevant question, I think I would rather not answer it. I have been taking the doctrine of the real presence of the Living (i.e. glorified) Lord in the Holy Sacrament for granted.

QUESTIONER: Might I ask the Bishop whether in the Acts of the Apostles sacramental union with Christ is not largely within the sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit, and is not one much more in the atmosphere of the Holy Spirit there; and, secondly, whether the loss of the true doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not responsible for some of those mediæval developments which are so much to be deplored; and, thirdly, whether there is any book written that he could recommend to us dealing with the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the doctrine of the Eucharist?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I should think it was profoundly true. No, I do not think there is a first-rate book. There is no subject on which I think a first-rate book is more wanted.

QUESTIONER: If the corporate character of the Communion was of great interest, as the Bishop of Oxford told

us, in the primitive Church, would it not be true to say that the Communion of the Sick at which there are only two or three present is at least as great a violation of that character as anything which is done?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Private Communion?

QUESTIONER: Yes, private Communion.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I think the great advantage of communicating the sick with the Reserved Sacrament is that it does maintain the corporate character of communion.

QUESTIONER: Is not private celebration as great a departure from the corporate idea as anything that is now done in the modern Church?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Yes, I always think that it has that great disadvantage—that it is a great weakening of the corporate character of communion.

Of course we are bound under our Prayer Book to use it wherever it is wanted, but I always do deplore it, I must say, from that point of view. The taking of the Sacrament from the corporate communion does seem to me to embody the corporate idea much more truly.

QUESTIONER: May I ask the Bishop of Oxford if he really thinks that those who advocate the practice of Reservation would reserve it for any other purpose than for Communion, and whether he is justified in saying that the fact is that they want to reserve it for adoration, because I think that anybody who understands the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament at all must know that there can be no other purpose for which to reserve it than Communion—no other purpose whatever?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: That I venture to say does seem to me to be sophistry. What you mean, I suppose, is

that at last it must be consumed, and therefore it is reserved for the purpose of Communion.

QUESTIONER: No, my lord, I mean that it is essentially and truly and really reserved for the purpose of Communion.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: Then may I take an instance to which I referred before. Here is a group of enclosed nuns. They are all young women; they are none of them sick, and there is no difficulty about any of them being communicated if they are sick, but they desire passionately the Reservation of the Sacrament for worship.

QUESTIONER: There might be sickness in the community?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred such occasional sickness could be quite well dealt with by reserving for the special case from the community Eucharists. I feel sure that there are a great many places

where Reservation is passionately desired, where the necessities of sickness arise rarely indeed in any such form as could not be met by such Reservation for the particular case, but where, none the less, permanent Reservation is demanded because it is desired for the purpose of devotion.

QUESTIONER: But, my lord, that does not really answer the question. The great accusation has been brought, I believe, in Convocation that the clergy who desire Reservation are prepared to resist their bishops at all costs, and that they are not genuinely honest and conscientious men. That is the point. I believe that the real reason why the clergy want to reserve is for the sick. Communities are special things, but parish churches are general all over the country, and the point is not so much the community as the parish church. Then there is another thing, and that is

that, after all, in the Church of England we have a species of Reservation, have we not, my lord, because in the Communion of the faithful in the Sacrament at the altar we do not consume the elements until after the Blessing, when there is plenty of opportunity for everybody in the church to have access to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament at the altar.

QUESTIONER: May I ask the Bishop of Oxford this question. Does not permanent open Reservation in a tabernacle as against secret Reservation make the Blessed Sacrament more accessible?

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I really deprecate the contrast, and I do not see why one is more accessible than the other, *for the purpose of Communion.*

QUESTIONER: Does it not make it known in the parish if it is reserved in a tabernacle openly? That is my point.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD: I deprecate

the contrast between open and secret. For many centuries it was the custom to reserve in the aumbry and not on the altar. There is nothing really in that method derogatory or underhand. It is simply a question of the conditions under which it is reserved, and I venture to think that you could make it as well known in the parish in one way as in the other.

QUESTIONER: May I ask the Bishop of Oxford if the Roman theologians say that the presence of our Lord in the Communion lasts for a few minutes, but in the tabernacle is abiding? Is the objection to Reservation that the Presence in the Communion is [only temporary]—that it is just in the act of communion [and no more]? Is the Presence continuous in the Blessed Sacrament during the time that elapses between the consecration and the communion of the sick, or is the Presence

simply and purely during the act of communion ?

The Bishop of Oxford : I have not the least doubt about how I must answer the question ; that is to say that the Presence is perpetual. You remember, I dare say, a passage in this sense which no doubt you have seen quoted from St. Cyril, with which I can heartily concur ; [1] but it does not seem to me that that in the least touches the question of our duty to keep strictly in view the purpose of the Presence, and the purpose of the Presence is the point. My difficulty about the whole Roman development is that it introduces into the matter a new purpose, and establishes amongst us a permanent external shrine of the Presence, which we have no reason to think was at all part of the Divine intention.

[1] "The virtue of the gift and His quickening grace are permanent in it."—*See* Gore, *The Body of Christ* (John Murray), p. 300.

## THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE

NOW I am afraid that I must draw the questions to a close. I should like, first, to thank heartily the Bishop of Oxford for his address. Whether we agree with all that he has said or not, we have to recognize that the Bishop of Oxford is one of the great forces in English life to-day, and we are very glad to have heard what he has had to say to us.

I want you to realize, my brethren, that although I have called you together on the question of Reservation I am not forgetful that there are other matters equally important. For instance, I view very seriously the laxity with regard to

the Holy Communion in very many parishes. I regard it as incumbent upon all clergy to really put the Holy Communion in the place in which I think our Lord and our Church intended it to be, and therefore I want you to grasp the fact that I am approaching this question as one who places the Holy Communion on a very high plane with regard to all that concern the Christian life. Nor am I insensible of the mutilation of the Office as appointed in the Prayer Book by serious omissions or additions on the part of individual clergy without any lawful authority. Then, further, I am not indifferent to those to whom the Bishop of Oxford referred, who attack the creed that they are ordained to teach, and I am heartily at one with him on that point. But to-day we are met together to consider this one particular question, namely, is it helpful that we should have the Holy Communion

reserved, not merely that it may be received by the sick, but reserved in *our open churches*? It may be said that it is, and for the moment I am not going to contradict it, but I do ask those who argue from the standpoint that because something "helps" it is admissible and advisable in our Church "Where are we going to stop?" People who are communicants of the Church of England are telling me and writing to me saying that they are finding tremendous comfort in Spiritualism at the present time. They say that it is a great comfort to hold converse with "husband" and with "son." They say that they find that they can even go to their Communion better on the following Sunday as the result. But, because some people say that they find it helpful, am I necessarily bound to tack on, say, Spiritualism to the Church? I am only putting it in this way, not that I would for one moment compare

the Reserved Sacrament with Spiritualism. I am only trying to make the argument clear that we must beware of simply accepting a thing because certain people say that it is helpful. We must get behind that and consider whether it is true. We must remember that, in the long run nothing can be really helpful to the soul that is not absolutely and without any controversy built upon the truth ; and therefore I want my brethren to examine their position with regard to this matter from that standpoint. Are we certain that because fifty people are found in a church praying before the Sacrament that they are more men and women of prayer than the members of other churches without Reservation ? Is Family Prayer so frequent ? Is there a Prayer Meeting in that parish ? Can any one say there is more real prayer in, for instance, All Saints', Margaret Street, parish than in St. Paul's, Onslow Square ?

Then, again, we want to remember, after all, that we are part of the great Catholic Church. I must make a brief comment upon the book of Dr. Darwell Stone which I know has been so widely read. I would not, of course minimize his scholarship nor his ability to present his opinions in a very popular form, but I would ask those who have read that book and are apt to say that they take it as their guide, whether there are not other authorities who take a different view, like, for instance, Mr. Freestone of the Community of the Resurrection, whose book the Bishop has already referred to (who left that as his last legacy to the Church before giving up his life in Mesopotamia when ministering to the Forces). I think that if you compare that book with Dr. Darwell Stone's book you will see at once that there is scholarship, that there is grasp and width of outlook quite as great as, if

not greater than, that which Dr. Darwell Stone brings to bear upon the question. Take again the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Talbot. Take again, if you will, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Ely, the Bishop of Gloucester, Canon Scott Holland, and I could continue mentioning scholar after scholar all of whom may be said to be connected directly with the Catholic school of thought in this country, who take a diametrically opposed view to that of Dr. Darwell Stone. So I want you, my brothers, to be careful to look all round the whole question and do not simply be led aside, either on one side or the other, by the glamour of some popular article that you may read. You want always to remember that the primitive practice of Reservation has had since those days a history and a history of extraordinary type, and we cannot view Reservation to-day as our brethren did in

the first, second and third centuries. That is a point which is frequently forgotten. You may read many things that were said in the first four or five centuries, but in reading them, you should remember that the writers had not before them what we have before us—the mediæval ideas connected with Reservation. We have to remember that fact, and also that we are face to face with Romanists in our very midst who practise and teach many things with which the Primitive Church had not to contend. The situation to-day is very different from that of the first century. Practices which might be quite harmless and even helpful in those days may be full of danger to-day owing to their associations and history. That, again, is a point that I want our brethren to remember.

Then there is the question of finality. Where are we to stop? That is a point

which I should like you seriously to consider. To put it quite bluntly, if anybody eight or nine or ten years ago had told me that the Bishop of Oxford would be regarded by any body of Catholics in this country as a "back number," I should not have believed it, and yet there are men to-day who say, shall I say, straight out, that the Bishop of Oxford is a Protestant and too Protestant for them. Some even say that Keble and Pusey are out of date and did not go far enough. The early Tractarians, rightly or wrongly, held that *all* they asked for was to be found within the Prayer Book, but is not that position openly abandoned by large numbers of clergy to-day? Now, when this is the case I ask my brethren where are we going to stop? What is the final stage? This is a serious position. We want to remember that the difficulty, in my opinion, has arisen because certain of our brethren

concentrate, shall I say, too much upon one aspect of the truth, which is always a danger. Take, for instance, our Baptist friends. Why are they called "Baptists"? Because they have exaggerated a Sacrament which we in the Church of England hold and hold tenaciously. Are we not in danger ourselves—and I say it with all reverence—of going to the other extreme and spending all our thought and all our attention upon the other Sacrament, great as it is? Go, if you will, into Roman Catholic countries. Some years ago I stayed in a village outside Rome with a friend who lived there. He and I went about the countryside, and he conversed with the villagers, and then translated for my benefit. He talked on the spot to many of the villagers who went to Roman Catholic churches. We could not find among those people any sort of idea of the Bible. The Bible to them was practically

an unknown book. None of them seemed to have a copy of it in their houses. None of them read it. We tried to get into conversation with them respecting the Holy Spirit, but you might just as well have said to those people "Have you so much as heard that there is the Holy Ghost?" Again, we spoke to them about the Divine presence of our Lord in their hearts; as to whether He was with them by day and by night; and again they seemed absolutely ignorant of the whole thing; and then when you went into the church you found large numbers of people kneeling before the Reserved Sacrament. When I paid that visit I never thought for one moment that I should occupy the position that I do to-day, but it set me thinking. We, in the English Church, pride ourselves—at least I think we do—that one of the great glories of the position of English Catholics is that we try to get things

in their right perspective; and that is a point that we must ever remember, and we must be careful about anything that would take us either to the right hand or to the left. Is it not true that the presence of Christ in His Church is always stated to be through the Holy Spirit? We must get things in the right perspective. I do not want to-day to enlarge upon that point.

We have been asked whether we could give any instance of the prohibition of the Church with regard to "Access" to the Holy Communion. I think that the answer to that is very clear, because the Eastern Church has never had to face this problem, and the Primitive Church never had to face this problem; neither of them advocated "Reservation *for* Adoration." It is only the Roman Church that really has had to face it, and those that are in direct communion with

her. Therefore there never has been the necessity to refuse access. The Roman Church, we know, has not refused it. It still keeps it, but our branch of the Western Church did surely do so, as the Bishop of Oxford pointed out, at the Reformation. The Primitive Church and the Eastern Church, have never been called upon to forbid Access to the Holy Communion for Devotion, because it has never been practised; it has never been part of their creed, never part of their teaching.

One more point. Before we place the Reserved Sacrament in our churches as an aid to worship, ought we not to be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt, that it was our Lord's intention that it should be used for such a purpose? To take anything which our Blessed Lord gave us for *one* purpose and to apply it to another, however laudable in itself, without His definite and clear

authority, is surely unthinkable. Therefore, is it sufficient to say that this or that was done with the Reserved Sacrament in such and such a century or by this Church or that? This is peculiarly our Lord's own Service, ordained under the shadow of the Cross. The Bread was broken, the Cup was blessed. The Sacred Bread was received and eaten, the Cup partaken of. Read the account of that first Celebration. Read Pliny and Jerome and any other references to those early days, and ask with the light which they throw upon our Lord's intention, whether Benediction, Exposition, or even "Access" comes within that Divine Intention so far as can be ascertained by us.

I have put these thoughts purposely in forms of queries. We want to think these questions out and face the correct answers whatever they are. If the Blessed Sacrament was ordained for one

" Use " only, let us keep to that " Use," but if, on the other hand, the Institution or the Teaching of the Apostles permit any secondary Use, then by all means let us not only tolerate but advocate that Use. But let us be clear on either course *before we act.* Will it suffice to say that *ultimately* the Sacrament will be used for our Lord's own purpose, but in the meantime we can put it to *any* other use which is said to be helpful to some ?

Is such a course permissible with regard to the Sacraments ordained by our Lord ?

Now, when I come to my own position may I say that naturally, as you would expect, I have had all kinds of letters addressed to me during the last few days or weeks, which I have been very glad to get, but if my brothers would only take the trouble to read what I write I think it would save their writing to me,

and if they would only notice the letter that I addressed to them in calling this meeting they would see that I asked that this morning there should be a service and that requests should be made in prayer for guidance, rather than that any special policy should prevail. Then I go on to say, " May I ask you to pray for an open mind." Now, that your Bishop should ask everybody to come to this meeting with an open mind excepting himself would not, I think, have been right. You would not for one moment expect, after I had written those words, that I should come here and stand definitely upon this platform and say straight out what my policy is going to be. I have been here, like yourselves, to sit at the feet of Dr. Gore. I have been here to listen to the questions that you have asked and also to hear the answers that have been given. I now ask that every clergyman who is

here to-day who has Reservation in any shape or form in his church, or in his parish, to write to me within the next two or three days and tell me quite frankly whether he has Reservation, and, if he has, where the Reserved Sacrament is kept and under what conditions. I want also to say that I shall be very glad to hear what any of my brothers have to say; only I must ask that this matter should not be hung up indefinitely, because I want to get on with other work. Therefore if any of you have anything to say to me I shall be very thankful to hear it. But when I have heard it and when I have gathered all your opinions together, what then? I shall have naturally to deal with this question, and I am going to put it to you, my brothers, seriously: after I have carefully thought it out and looked all round I have to give a decision. What is going to be the result of that

decision? Are we going to be in chaos? If there is one thing that I dread more than another it is chaos with all the tremendous problems that are before us,—the gigantic problems. The world is in the melting-pot. Who would have dreamed a few years ago that Russia would be a Republic? Who would have dreamed that China would be a Republic? A thousand things are possible in England to-day. Now, are we, in the midst of all this, to have a controversy waged in the Church far more violent than anything that has ever gone before? Is it worth the price? I am going to appeal to you. For three years I have been your Bishop. I know how unworthy I am to fill that office, but I ask you here, my brethren, have I tried to be fair? ("You have.") Have I tried since I became Bishop to put aside my own personal views and have I tried so far as I could, mistakenly

it may have been at times, to really grasp what the exact feeling of the Church of England was, in its comprehensive spirit ; and, having done that, have I tried, so far as I could, not to thwart men but to meet men ? Have I not tried to conciliate, rather than to obstruct ?

Now, having said that, may I add, that whatever action I take I cannot possibly please everybody. There are men here to-day who do not like Reservation at all ; there are men here to-day who want it in the open church ; there are men who have written to me quite frankly and said that they believe in Benediction,—that they believe in Exposition and that they would like to have both. Now what am I to do ? You must remember that, whatever I do, I shall not do simply as—who shall I say ?—John Edwin Watts-Ditchfield, but as a Bishop of the whole Church, as the embodiment of the whole body ; and therefore what-

ever I do has to be done paying full regard to that fact. I want you to realize, my brothers, that my position is no easy one. It is a very, very difficult one indeed. I want to do right. I have thrown myself upon your prayers. I want your prayers, and I want your sympathy. I appeal to every man here, whether he is what you may call an ultra-Protestant, or an Advanced Churchman, or whether he belongs to what you may call the Central body of Churchmen, I appeal to all alike, do not wreck the work of the Church in this diocese. Do not wreck my episcopate. I hesitated as to coming to be your Bishop. I have lost much in coming; I have lost that personal touch that was the glory and the life and the joy of my own heart, though I have had some counterbalancing helps. I have had the kindness and the generosity and the love and the sympathy of large bodies of the clergy

in this diocese, and that is no light matter. But I ask you to go away and realize that, whatever my decision may be, it will be made only after the most profound thought, the most concentrated prayer, and also after consultation with those whom I hold dear and respect in the Church at large. I am not going to act entirely off my own bat ; I am going to try, so far as in me lies, to gather up the opinions of different kinds of men, and then humbly lay myself at the foot of the Cross and pray " Lord, what wouldst Thou have me to do ? " and when I come to my decision, brothers, whatever it is, it will hurt me beyond all if any of my clergy think that I have made that decision arrogantly or as a man who is going to enforce the law. Whatever decision I come to will be made as your " Father-in-God," and therefore I do ask you, my brethren, to go away and wait in prayer for my decision. Do not hastily

be led this way or that. Do not form yourselves into groups simply to magnify the particular opinions that you hold. I think that doing so has done an enormous amount of harm in the past. Men have just formed themselves into a group, have formed themselves into a society, to advance one particular aim, and they have got it consequently out of its true perspective. Try to just get at the foot of the Cross and seek for guidance.

I will close by saying that I started my work amongst you as Bishop at my Enthronement by saying that I have one motto, "Essex for Christ." That is still my motto; but if Essex is to be won there must be a united Church; there must be a Church living in close communion with her Lord; there must be a Church constantly feeding upon the Bread of Life; and there must be a Church filled with the Holy Spirit of God; and as your Bishop, therefore, I

appeal to you to-day and ask you to throw yourselves more and more into the arms of the eternal Son of God. Will you just quietly stand? Let us have a moment in silence.

I will ask the Bishop of Oxford to give us the Blessing.

*Printed for* ROBERT SCOTT, *Publisher*, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, *by* BUTLER & TANNER, FROME

GRADUATE SCHOOL
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

# From ROBERT SCOTT'S List

**HERE AND HEREAFTER.** By the BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD. **3s. 6d.** net.

"The Bishop has put his best work into these Meditations."—*British Weekly.*

**THE CHURCH IN ACTION.** By the BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD. **2s. 6d.** net.

"A text-book of sane and practical suggestions."—*The Standard.*

**PLAIN TALKS ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.** By Dr. EUGENE STOCK. **5s.** net.

"There is a brightness and freshness about every page and the reader assimilates an immense amount of real solid information in the easiest and most pleasant way."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

**MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES.** By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A. **2s. 6d.** net.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.** By the Rev. C. W. EMMET, M.A. The latest commentary on Galatians. **3s. 6d.** net.

"A commentary of independence and ripe scholarship . . . the argument in favour of an early date for the Epistle, a date *preceding* the Apostolic Council of Acts xv, is given in fulness and with astounding force of conviction. For that great argument alone the book is worth buying."—*Expository Times.*

**ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.** By the Rev. H. G. GREY. **3s. 6d.** net.

**THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.** Faithfully rendered into English Rhythm after the manner in which it was written. By THOMAS A'KEMPIS. With a Preface by the late CANON LIDDON. New Pocket Edition: **2s.** net. Leather Editions: paste grain, **3s. 6d.** net; calf, **5s.** net; Turkey morocco, **6s.** net, Presentation Binding, velvet leather yapp, **4s. 6d.** net.

**THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.** Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holy-Days throughout the Year. By JOHN KEBLE. Uniform with "The Imitation of Christ." Cloth, extra gilt, silk register, gilt top, **2s.** net. Leather Editions: paste grain, **3s. 6d.** net; calf, **5s.** net; Turkey morocco, **6s.** net.

*Full List of Lenten and Easter Books free on Application.*

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

265.36R
G66

6

65315

S0-FIY-664